

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 10, 2007. Claims 10 and 21 remain in this application. Claims 10 and 21 are the independent Claims. Claims 10 and 21 have been amended for clarity. Claims 1-9 and 11-20, and 22-49 have been canceled without prejudice. It is believed that no new matter is involved in the amendments or arguments presented herein.

Reconsideration and entrance of the amendment in the application are respectfully requested.

Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1-5, 11, 41, 46, 48, and 49 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-35 of U.S. Patent No. 7,141,614. Applicant's cancellation of the rejected claims moots this rejection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejection are respectfully requested.

Specification Objections

The disclosure was objected to because of informalities. In response, Applicant has amended the specification in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

Claims 4 and 14 were objected to because of an informality. Applicant's cancellation of those claims moots the objections.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above objection are respectfully requested.

Non-Art Based Rejections

Claims 1-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner states that there is no clear definition for the term "a(meth)acryls compound (B)." This rejection is moot with respect to the cancelled claims. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicant has changed "(meth)acryls compound (B)" to --(meth)acrylic compound (B)--. To overcome this rejection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above § 112 rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness; Claims 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention; Claims 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant's cancellation of the rejected claims moots this rejection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above § 112 rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 12-22 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant's cancellation of the claims 12-20 and 22 moots the above objection with respect to those claims. With respect to Claim 21, that claim has been rewritten in independent form to overcome the objection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above objection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 28-40 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant's cancellation of the objected-to claims moots the above objection

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above objection are respectfully requested.

Art-Based Rejections

Claims 1-8, 11, 41, and 43-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,025,113 (Kikkawa); Claims 1-8, 11, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,608,333 (Ohbayashi); Claims 1-8, 11-17, 22, 26, 41, and 43-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over WO 03/038526 A1 (Okada); Claims 1-9, 11-20, 22-25, 27-42, and 46-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Okada; Claims 1, 2, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over JP 2000-147768 A (JP '768); Claims 1, 2, 11, 23, 24, 41, 46, 47, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over JP '768; Claims 1, 2, 11, 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over JP 59-068331 A (JP '331).

These rejections are moot by the cancellation of the rejected claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejection are respectfully requested>

The Claims are Patentable Over Okada

Accordingly, the remaining Claims 10 and 21, which were not subject to any art based rejections, are believed to be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested. Claims 10 and 21 have been amended for clarity.

Appl. No. 10/553,272
Amdt. Dated February 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of October 10, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 89227.0010
Customer No.: 26021

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4721 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: February 8, 2008

By: 

Dariush G. Adli
Registration No. 51,386
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310-785-4600
Fax: 310-785-4601